

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

---

**IN RE: YASMIN AND YAZ (DROSPIRENONE)  
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND  
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

---

) **3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF**  
) **MDL No. 2100**  
)  
**ORDER**

**This Document Relates to:**

**Kelly Brockman v. McKesson Corp., et al.  
No. 3:10-cv-20311-DRH-PMF**

**Karalyn Cardinale v. Bayer HealthCare  
Pharms., Inc., et al. No. 3:10-cv-11617-DRH-PMF**

**Emily Mixon v. Bayer HealthCare  
Pharms., Inc., et al. No. 3:10-cv-10715-DRH-PMF**

**Glenishe Rowe v. Bayer HealthCare  
Pharms., Inc., et al. No. 3:10-cv-10718-DRH-PMF**

**ORDER**

**HERNDON, Chief Judge:**

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s ("Bayer") motion to show cause why Plaintiffs' claims should not be dismissed without prejudice. To date, Plaintiffs have not responded to Bayer's motion.

In each of the above captioned cases the Court granted a motion to withdraw filed by each Plaintiff's counsel (Brockman DOC. 16 (11/18/10); Cardinale DOC. 11 (11/29/10); Mixon DOC. 7 (11/29/10); Rowe DOC. 9

(11/29/10)). Plaintiffs were required, pursuant to **local rule 83.1(g)(2)**, to file a supplementary appearance within 21 days of the entry of the Order.<sup>1</sup> To date, Plaintiffs have not filed a supplementary appearance.<sup>2</sup>

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), a complaint may be involuntarily dismissed where a Plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with the rules or a court order. **See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)**. The Court will grant Plaintiffs one final opportunity to demonstrate some interest in the further prosecution of their claims. Plaintiffs are hereby given until **January 18, 2011, to file an appearance as required by local rule 83.1(g)**. **If Plaintiffs fail to file an entry of appearance by this deadline, Plaintiffs' cases will be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b)**.

**SO ORDERED**

 David R. Herndon  
2011.01.10 17:42:39  
-06'00'

**Chief Judge  
United States District Court**

**Date: January 10, 2010**

---

<sup>1</sup> The orders in Cardinale, Mixon, and Rowe expressly gave each Plaintiff "21 days to either file an appearance on her own behalf or have new counsel appear for her, as required by **Local Rule 83.1(g)(2)**" (Cardinale DOC. 11 at 4; Mixon DOC. 7 at 22; Rowe DOC. 9 at 3).

<sup>2</sup> The Order in Mixon also provided: "If Plaintiff or her new counsel timely files a supplementary entry of appearance she will be given 45 days from the entry of her or her new counsel's appearance to serve her Plaintiff Fact Sheet. If Plaintiff or her new counsel fails to file a supplementary entry of appearance within 21 days of the entry of this Order, Plaintiff's action will be subject to dismissal without prejudice for failure to comply with this Order and with her Plaintiff Fact Sheet requirements." (Doc. 7). In Mixon an Answer was served on August 5, 2010, triggering Plaintiff's obligation to provide a Plaintiff Fact Sheet (Doc. 4). Answers had not been filed in Cardinale, Rowe, or Brockman, and accordingly, the Court concluded that it was unnecessary to provide Plaintiffs with a Plaintiff Fact Sheet extension.